Note: Inquiry of RADC re their printer: Ten companies I.F.B. Two responses -

[redacted]

23 April 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR RECORD

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Proposals on Specific Format Chip Printer

25X1A
25X1A

1. Nine companies were recommended to furnish proposals on subject printer. One [redacted] was not cleared and one invitation (to [redacted] was evidentally mismailed to some other company. Of the seven firm invitations there were four companies proposed on the printer.

2. A thorough technical evaluation and a cost versus engineering hours breakdown was made of the four submissions with the following results in order of preference:

25X1A
25X1A
25X1A

a. [redacted] - 14 months - [redacted] This company submitted an extremely complete proposal thoroughly considering all parameters contained in the Performance Requirements. They presented logical and acceptable methods of meeting requirements and proposed alternative solutions where a choice was available. There is strong probability that a substantial reduction in price can be achieved by deletion or revision of some requirements (RFI-50K). [redacted] also bid on the basis of a fourteen month contract. ~~It is felt this is to short a duration considering the detail that must be contained in the breadboard phase and eighteen months will be proposed to them if awarded the contract.~~ [redacted] was also the only bidder who gave consideration to a light-lens system to handle silver-halide, diazonium and polymer senstized materials.

25X1A

was proposed - they feel 14 mo is satisfactory & don't desire a longer period.

25X1A

25X1A
25X1A
25X1A

b. [redacted] - 25 months - [redacted] plus [redacted] for installation. This company has submitted a very complete and comprehensive proposal. All details in the Performance Requirements with few exceptions have been considered. Two factors that have placed this proposal second in order are: (1) Extreme sophistication resulting in (2) excessive cost. The transport system is extremely complicated, containing over fifty film ~~film~~ rollers and/or compensator rollers

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Proposals on Specific Format Chip Printer

b. (cont'd) which cannot help but provide a very good film metering system.

Their control system contains an overlarge amount of sophisticated electronics which, although meeting the requirements, is felt to far surpass the intended use. The platen system proposed for printing is the best submitted and although requiring considerable breadboarding, appears to be an excellent approach.

25X1A In most aspects of the proposal [redacted] appears to have given considerable thought to the requirements and has presented good workable solutions. However, the amount of detailed sophistication is felt to be more than required in the end product.

25X1A

25X1A c. [redacted] - 14 months - [redacted].

25X1A The proposal submitted by [redacted] was not up to their customary type of effort in that it was very incomplete, very few of the recognized problems were definatized and considerable experimentation was recommended. They apparently misinterpreted the requirements in the area of input data, relying on manual film transport, manual x-y and azimuth positioning, using the tape input only for print-out of the auxiliary data. Their proposed transport system was one of extreme simplification and would provide insufficient film control. The entire negative transport system is exposed for positioning and measuring, then slides into the contact exposure station for printing. This,

25X1A it is felt, would create unnecessary movement and vibration affecting the high quality output required. [redacted] did propose a film cutter as an integral part of the printer, furnishing the properly formatted output in chip form for processing in their chip ~~printer~~ proposed which is already under contract to NPIC. Their proposed method of printing the auxiliary information by first photographing by an electrostatic process then projecting to the dupe film base is a potential source of trouble.

25X1A d. [redacted] - 22 months - [redacted]

25X1A plus [redacted] for destination training. This proposal is the least technically acceptable of those submitted due

25X1A to their recommended use of absolute ethyl alcohol in a liquid gate system. This is not only a volatile liquid, but also highly inflammable. The proposal contains numerous references to the fire hazards such as saturating the dupe film transport chamber with CO_2 atmosphere to forestall fire due to electrostatic discharge from unrolling film. The negative film drive mechanism is oversimplified, relying on a torque motor and belt drive to maintain film tension. It is extremely doubtful that the proposed film measuring system

SUBJECT: Evaluation of Proposals on Specific Format Chip Printer

d. (cont'd) would meet the requirements. There is listed a sequence of operations which, if carried out as outlined, would never attain the requirement of ten prints per minute. In view of the fire hazard aspect, the combining of vacuum, high volume air pressure and CO_2 pressurizing in the same chamber, an exposed transport and measuring system, and other deficiencies noted, it is recommended this company not be considered as a source for contracting.

3. A cost versus engineering hours expended by phases is attached.

4. The Performance Requirements covering this chip printer left the type of dupe film (cut or roll film) entirely up to the proposing companies. 25X1A All bidders came forth with roll film handling mechanisms throughout the system. [redacted] proposed to cut the roll film into the chip at the end of the printing process. This I feel is indicative of the problems associated with chip handling mechanisms.

Only one bidder included in his proposal the capability for handling 25X1A diazo materials as well as silver halide. [redacted]

Two bidders proposed exterior negative film transport systems and manual positioning and orientation rather than automatic or semi- 25X1A automatic. The exposed transport system necessities movement of the entire transport into and under the printing station, which creates additional vibration and probable loss of accurate position. [redacted] and 25X1A [redacted]

25X1A 5. This evaluation has resulted in two bidders being considered acceptable - [redacted] Both have present logical 25X1A solutions to the requirements and both have some unique and desirable features incorporated. [redacted] is considered most acceptable as their proposal is more in keeping with the intent of the requirements. They have not tried to "gold-plate" by adding sophisticated design features and intricate and possibly unnecessary features.

25X1A 25X1A Recommendation will be made to TDC that [redacted] be awarded the contract on an ~~eighteen~~ 14 month delivery basis ~~with consideration of a reduction in price by revision or deletion of some requirements and a CPIF contract~~.

25X1A [redacted]

Approved For Release 2001/03/06 : CIA-RDP78B04747A000400030005-0

File Copy

SECRET
(When Filled In)

30 April 1964

TECHNICAL BACKGROUND PROCUREMENT INFORMATION

I. Contractor

A. Name and address: [redacted] 25X1A

[redacted] 25X1A

B. Evaluation of previous performance: None - New Contractor

II. Brief description of this procurement: Specific Format Chip Printer

Estimated total amt. [redacted] 25X1A

A. Deliverable items: Chip Printer

B. Is this procurement for other than a standard, "off the shelf" or slightly modified commercial item? Yes If "yes", is it anticipated that any more of this unit will be procured? No If so, a complete set of directly reproducible manufacturing drawings and specifications would normally be included in this procurement. Comments:

C. Will contract cover a period of more than 90 days? Yes If "yes", are progress reports desired? Yes If so, indicate frequency, content and number of copies desired: 4 Copies monthly

Progress report, financial expendures, schedule changes, technical memorandum when necessary.

D. Is any Government-owned property to be provided to the contractor?

No If so, list and indicate its availability (where, when, etc.)

SECRET
(When Filled In)

E. Is any special tooling involved? No

F. Security:

1. Association with the Sponsor is Confidential

2. The specifications and/or drawings are Unclassified

3. The item is Unclassified

4. Contractor personnel known to be aware of this proposed procurement:

25X1A [redacted]

5. Other security information No plant facility check has been made. Insufficient number of cleared personnel.

III. Reasons for selection of this source. If other sources were considered, indicate results. If no other sources were considered, list the reasons why this firm is considered to be uniquely qualified to perform this work.

Technical Evaluation:

Of the seven sources solicited, four proposed. The remaining three were considered unacceptable for reasons of ultra-sophistication, resulting in extremely high costs, mis-understanding of the associated problems and not meeting performance requirements.

IV. Technical contact 25X1A [redacted] (Name) 3308 (Telephone)

In the event additional space is required, use the reverse side(s) of this form, with a reference to the item number to which the comment applies.

#1

25X1A [redacted] - 14 months - [redacted] CPFF

1. Possible reduction in cost if allowed complete evaluation of system requirement i.e. [redacted] allowed for RFI suppression.
25X1A
25X1A
2. Roll film output - will propose processor & cutter if allowed.
3. Breakdown: Prelim Design - 1 month [redacted]
Breadboard - 3 month
Fabrication - 6½ month
25X1A
Pre-ship Test - 2 month
RFI Test - 1½ month
Final Test - 1½ month
Dwgs
Manuals
Training -
4. Extremely complete proposal - have considered all parameters in Performance Requirements, have presented a logical and acceptable method of meeting them.

Positive dupe material relative to neg for orientation
positive orig neg relative to dupe mat for x-y.
Diazo + Silver Halide capability included.
Pressure rate - no liquid gate
Location of mask - above plate -
Security Application printing - low?

Next 2 Page(s) In Document Exempt